

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Parent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONED FOR PATENTS P.O. 55,01410 Alexandra, Circinia 22313-1450 www.busplo.gov

			$\mathcal{V}$			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/437,352	11/09/1999	DIMITRI KANEVSKY	YO999-411	7851		
7590 10/20/2006			EXAMINER			
KEVIN M MASON			ZAND, K	ZAND, KAMBIZ		
RYAN MASON	I & LEWIS LLP					
1300 POST ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 205			2132			
FAIRFIELD, CT 06430			DATE MAILED: 10/20/2000	DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/437,352	KANEVSKY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kambiz Zand	2132		

	Kampiz Zand	2132				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below),  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	-	ejected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-58</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
13. Other:		KAMBIZ PRIMARY 8				
		Kambiz Zand				
		Examiner				

Art Unit: 2132

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

- a) Applicant's arguments with respect to prior art of records have been considered by the BPAI with respect to the claims (see Decision on Appeal, mailed on 03/23/2006), filing an RCE is NOT a process to by pass the BPAI decision on the already rejected claims limitations. All Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims limitations already considered by the BPAI in light of the Prior Art of Records are moot in that regards.
- b) The added limitation into independent claims 1, 16, 27, 38, 39, 42, 49, 52 and 55 only is incorporation of a portable device assigned to a user into the claim language. However the BPAI on page 2, paragraph 1 of their decision have considered applicant's invention having a portable device and they rendered the decision based on such undrestanding, therefore the added limitation only disclose what thay already have considered as the environment of the claims. Furthermore Li's abstract disclose mobile device such as the phone; fig.1 and associated texts also disclosing such features. therefore applicant's arguments are not persuasive.
- C) Examiner suggests that if applicant do not want to incorporate further limitations into independent claims that have not been considered by the BPAI directly as part of the claim language or indirectly as part of the enviornment in which invention had been considered (such as already added limitation), then the best course of action is filing an appeal.
- d) Examiner would reconsider if new added limitations into the independent claims have not considered by the BPAI already as long as it does not raise new issue that require further consideration or possible search.